

REMARKS

Claims 3-27 are currently pending, claim 27 being independent. Claims 3-7, 15-17 and 20-26 were withdrawn by the Examiner following an election in response to a Restriction Requirement. Independent claim 27 has been amended to further define the subject matter, as suggested in the last office action mailed March 24, 2010, (“the office action,” *see* page 5). The amendment is supported throughout the specification, for example, on page 11, lines 9-12, page 24, lines 22 to page 25, line 2 and FIGS. 1 and 13. No new matter has been added.

In view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are allowable and the application should be passed to issue.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 11, 13, 14, 18, 19 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tanimoto (JP 10-110,887) in view of Edgel (US 4,579,756). Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

However, as suggested on page 5 of the office action, and in an effort to expedite prosecution, independent claim 27 has been amended to recite, in pertinent part, that the **“plurality of core members are disposed in a zigzag layout at mutual specific intervals so as to form folding lines in four directions in the position between the adjacent core members.”** None of the cited references teach or suggest such a configuration. As such, claim 27 is allowable. Furthermore, claims 8-14, 18 and 19 depend from claim 27 and therefore are also allowable.

Claim 12 was rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Tanimoto in view of Edgel and further in view of Miyoshi (JP 08-303686)¹. Applicants respectfully disagree.

However, as discussed above, in an effort to expedite prosecution, independent claim 27 has been amended to recite, in pertinent part, that the “plurality of core members are disposed in a zigzag layout at mutual specific intervals so as to form folding lines in four directions in the position between the adjacent core members.”

As discussed above, neither Tanimoto nor Edgel teach or suggest a configuration in which the “plurality of core members are disposed in a zigzag layout at mutual specific intervals so as to form folding lines in four directions in the position between the adjacent core members,” as recited in claim 27.

Furthermore, Miyoshi does not cure this deficiency. As such, claim 27 is allowable. Furthermore, claims 8-14, (including claim 12), 18 and 19 depend from claim 27 and therefore are also allowable.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application be allowed and the case passed to issue. If there are any questions regarding this Amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated to expedite the prosecution of the application.

¹ Applicants note that Stroobants (US 6,322,743) is also referred to in the rejection, however none of the cited references, including Stroobants, teach or suggest all of the elements of amended claim 1, as at a minimum, none of the cited references teach or suggest a configuration in which “[the] plurality of core members are disposed in a zigzag layout at mutual specific intervals so as to form folding lines in four directions in the position between the adjacent core members.”

Application No.: 10/537,298

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

for - Amer Syed Ahmed 58, 958
Michael E. Fogarty
Registration No. 36,139

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF:ASA:ajb
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: June 23, 2010

**Please recognize our Customer No. 53080
as our correspondence address.**